

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for the clarity and conciseness of the Office Action and for the citation of the references which have been studied with interest and care.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102 [103]

Claims 1, 3, 6 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) [sic] as being anticipated by SMEULDERS et al. (Tracking Nonparameterized Object Contours in Video) in view of SELSIS et al. (Automatic Tracking and 3D Localization of Moving Objects by Active Contour Models).

SMEULDERS et al. discloses a method for contour tracking in video using a search band *C*. For the Examiner's convenience, claim 1 is set forth below:

1. (original) A method for converting two-dimensional images into three-dimensional images, comprising:
tracking an object in an image, the object having an object edge and an object outline thereabout, from frame to frame over a sequence of images; and
creating object outlines in subsequent frames for converting two-dimensional images into three-dimensional images maintaining an object outline to object edge distance spacing relationship as the object moves or changes from frame to frame.

SMEULDERS et al. does not disclose or suggest "creating object outlines in subsequent frames for converting two-dimensional images into three-dimensional images...". Nor does this reference disclose or suggest "maintaining an object outline to object edge distance spacing relationship as the object moves or changes from frame to frame." In SMEULDERS et al., the search band *C* is used *in the tracking process*, not to maintain (force) an object outline to object edge distance spacing relationship as the object moves or changes from frame to frame.

SELSIS et al. discloses using an epipolar constraint to reduce the number of possible matches in the matching problem. The generalized teaching in SELSIS et al. of temporal and stereoscopic matching does not equate to a disclosure or suggestion of "creating object outlines in subsequent frames... [and] maintaining an object outline to object edge distance spacing relationship as the object moves or changes from frame to frame." Even if SELSIS et al. is properly combined with SMEULDERS et al., the collective teachings of these references, which focus on object tracking, clearly fail to disclose or suggest the subject recited in claim 1. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Objections to Claims

Claims 2, 4, 5, 7 and 9-10 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable in their present form. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Allowed Claims

Applicants gratefully acknowledge that claims 11-30 are allowed.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Concurrence by the Examiner and early passage of the application to issue are respectfully requested.

Any additional fees which are required in connection with this communication and which are not specifically provided for herewith are authorized to be charged to deposit account no. 500651. Any overpayments are also authorized to be credited to this account.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter L. Holmes
Reg. No. 37,353
Attorney for Applicants

April 10, 2005

HENRICKS, SLAVIN & HOLMES LLP
840 Apollo Street, Suite 200
El Segundo, California 90245-4737
Telephone: (310) 563-1454
Facsimile: (310) 563-1460